

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			N/.\
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1.0
	10/650,300	SISHTLA, VISHNU M	1.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Marc E. Norman	3744	
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with	the corresp ndence addre	SS
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL	VIC SET TO EXPIRE 2 MON	ITH(S) EDOM	
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replevation of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute that the period for reply will, by statute the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply ly within the statutory minimum of thirty (3 will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS e, cause the application to become ABANI	be timely filed  0) days will be considered timely.  5 from the mailing date of this commodoneD (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27.4	August 2003.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed		s, prosecution as to the mo	erits is
closed in accordance with the practice under			
Disposition of Claims			
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-8</u> is/are pending in the application.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	wn from consideration.	•	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>02 January 2004</u> is/are		cted to by the Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct			1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).	
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	The state of the s	(-) (-) ()	
1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documen	ts have been received.		
2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documen		lication No	
3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the price			age
application from the International Burea			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ceived.	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Sum	ımary (PTO-413)	
2) Dotice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/M	fail Date	:0)
<ol> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ol>	) 5) ☐ Notice of Infor 6) ☐ Other:	mal Patent Application (PTO-15	<b>4</b> )

Application/Control Number: 10/650,300

Art Unit: 3744

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lundblad et al.

As per claim 1, Lundblad et al. discloses baffle plate assembly 27 with first and second opposing sides attached to an inner surface (22, 23) of a refrigerator apparatus 2 (Figures 5 and 6), and a baffle seal plate attached along a third side of the baffle plate (again see Figures 5 and 6) and attached to the inner surface of the refrigerator apparatus (via the side plates).

As per claim 2, Lundblad et al. discloses the baffle plate, baffle seal plate, and the inner surface defining a concavity (column 5, lines 5-6; Figure 6).

As per claim 3, Lundblad et al. discloses discharge pipe 20a.

As per claim 4, Lundblad et al. discloses the apparatus being an economizer (Abstract, line 1).

As per claim 5, Lundblad et al. discloses the baffle plate being welded to the inner surface (column 5, line 5).

As per claim 7, Lundblad et al. discloses the seal plate being welded to the inner surface (via the side plates).

Application/Control Number: 10/650,300

Art Unit: 3744

As per claim 8, Lundblad et al. discloses an economizer assembly comprising economizer 2 having an outlet 20a and an inlet 16; and a baffle structure 27 between the outlet and inlet dampening flow pulstations (by dispersing high velocity flow over a wide horizontal area and eliminating flash gas; see column 6, lines 13-26).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lundblad et al.

As per claim 6, Lundblad et al. does not teach the seal plate being welded to the baffle plate. However, as recited (see column 5, lines 9-11), this is simply for the purpose of saving cost. Welded joints are common and well known in the art, and clearly anticipated by Lundblad et al. as an option (again, see column 5, lines 9-11). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to weld the joints between the vertical

Art Unit: 3744

sides and ends of the baffle assembly of Lundblad et al. for the purpose of providing a more solid connection therebetween, in the instance where cost is not an overriding factor.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marc E. Norman whose telephone number is 703-305-2711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 8:00-5:30, with first Fridays off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Denise Esquivel can be reached on 703-308-2597. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MN

MARC NORMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER